DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 591 FL 010 825

AUTHOR Metcalf, Allan A.
TITLE Chicano English. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 21.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 38p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($2.95)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Dialect Studies; English; Intonation; Language Research; *Language Variation; *Mexican Americans; *Pronunciation; *Regional Dialects; *Spanish; Stress (Phonology); Syntax; Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS California; *Chicano English; Information Analysis Products; *Southwestern States

ABSTRACT

The English spoken by Spanish-surnamed Americans of the southwestern United States often has a Spanish flavor, even though the speakers may have no competence in Spanish. This Chicano English is discussed in a series of descriptions based on a number of previous studies of regional variations. Each description covers pronunciation, intonation, stress, vocabulary, and syntax. Regions covered include California (East Los Angeles, Riverside and vicinity, Redwood City, Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Whittier), Arizona, New Mexico (Las Vegas), and Texas (San Antonio in the 1950's and in 1970, Fort Worth-Dallas, and Austin). From the evidence of the individual descriptions, certain general conclusions are drawn about the linguistic feature of Chicano English, and especially about its dependence on Spanish influence. Pedagogical implications of this Spanish background are briefly discussed. A partially annotated bibliography is appended. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176591

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

21

Chicano English

Allan A. Metcalf

FL 010825

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for Applied Linguistics
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Published by
Center for Applied Linguistics

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics

Language in Education: Theory and Practice
Series ISBN: 87281-092-5

ISBN: 87281-107-7

September 1979
Copyright © 1979
By the Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Printed in the U.S.A.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a nationwide network of information centers, each responsible for a given educational level or field of study. ERIC is supported by the National Institute of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The basic objective of ERIC is to make current developments in educational research, instruction, and personnel preparation more readily accessible to educators and members of related professions.

ERIC/CLL. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC/CLL), one of the specialized clearinghouses in the ERIC system, is operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC/CLL is specifically responsible for the collection and dissemination of information in the general area of research and application in languages, linguistics, and language teaching and learning.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. In addition to processing information, ERIC/CLL is also involved in information synthesis and analysis. The Clearinghouse commissions recognized authorities in languages and linguistics to write analyses of the current issues in their areas of specialty. The resultant documents, intended for use by educators and researchers, are published under the title Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* The series includes practical guides for classroom teachers, extensive state-of-the-art papers, and selected bibliographies.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Linguistic Society of America and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either LSA, TESOL, or NIE. This publication is not printed at the expense of the Federal Government.

This publication may be purchased directly from the Center for Applied Linguistics. It also will be announced in the ERIC monthly abstract journal Resources in Education (RIE) and will be available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corp., P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. See RIE for ordering information and ED number.

For further information on the ERIC system, ERIC/CLL, and Center/Clearinghouse publications, write to ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209.

From 1974 through 1977, all Clearinghouse publications appeared as the CAL-ERIC/CLL Series on Languages and Linguistics. Although more papers are being added to the original series, the majority of the ERIC/CLL information analysis products will be included in the Language in Education series.

Signs are not always as simple as they seem. A red sky predicts a calm day as well as a storm; NO ADMISSION can mean that a theater admits everyone free, or that it is closed to all; INFLAMMABLE no longer is painted on gasoline trucks, because too many motorists thought it meant there was no danger of fire.

This paper deals with signs that sometimes are misinterpreted, even by experts. The signs are these: Spanish surname or given name; residence in a Spanish-speaking community in the territory once belonging to Mexico in the southwestern states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado; Mexican birth, ancestry, or relatives; straight black hair and brown skin; self-identification as Mexican-American or Chicano.[1] If, in addition to one or more of these characteristics, observers notice what clearly sounds like a Spanish accent, they might logically conclude that the subject is a native speaker of Spanish. Logically, but sometimes erroneously.

For a Spanish accent does not always mean a Spanish speaker. The Southwest today includes many hundreds of thousands--perhaps millions --of people whose native language is a special variety of English with a Spanish sound to it. The curious thing about this Spanish accent is that it is often heard from people who have no ability to speak or understand Spanish, people who are monolingual as well as perfectly fluent in English. Their variety of English has been termed "Spanish-influenced English,"[2] a label that aptly characterizes both the way it sounds and the way it came into being. But such a term can be misleading, since it also implies that the Spanish influence is a continuing one. In fact, however, the speaker of what I will call Chicano English learns it by growing up among speakers of that particular variety of English--just as others, by growing up in the appropriate localities, learn the types of English spoken in London, Boston, Newark, Minneapolis, Baton Rouge, Sydney, or New Delhi.

This, then, is the point: a Spanish accent against a Chicano background can have two possible meanings. One, that the speaker is indeed fluent in Spanish and not so fluent in English; the other, that the speaker is fluent in a distinctive variety of English, regardless of fluency in Spanish (and often with negligible ability in Spanish).

The existence of the latter, this Chicano English, has been overlooked and under-studied. Neither the purists' disdain for mixing languages,[3] nor the scholars' focus on Spanish-Mexican roots,[4] nor the Chicanos' emphasis on a distinctive heritage[5] fully explains this lack of attention. More significant in keeping Chicano English from proper notice, surely, is its similarity to the accent of a Spanish speaker who is just learning English (a similarity that has led one researcher to declare that there is no such thing as Chicano English).[6] But, in

fact, there is growing evidence that it does exist as a distinct entity, and that it is widespread. Chicano English is not just an oddity to be studied by linguists, but a phenomenon that must be taken into account in classrooms throughout the Southwest.

The Languages of the Southwest

In order to determine how best to deal with Chicano English in the classroom, we must first make clear what it is, and what distinguishes it from other varieties of English spoken in the formerly Spanish territories of the United States. To do so requires a brief orientation to the complex language situation of the Southwest.

Even ignoring the languages spoken by the first inhabitants, the Indians, the language varieties spoken in the Southwest have always been diverse. The aridity and roughness of the terrain made settlement sparse and discontinuous until the current century. Even now, the desert land and climate continue to concentrate the population in widely separated urban and irrigated places. Just as New Mexico, Texas, Arizona, and California were colonized and developed separately under Spanish rule, so these border states have had their distinct histories of settlement, development, and government down to the present day.

Southwestern Spanish

The language varieties that developed in these places reflected the origins and prestige of those who first settled in appreciable numbers. If sufficiently isolated from its neighbors, each community or region developed its pattern of speaking without regard to changes in the parent language community. Early settlement (New Mexico as long ago as 1598)[7] and prolonged isolation thus made for considerable variety in the Spanish spoken in the southwestern United States. In the twentieth century, new waves of Mexican immigration brought more recent regional varieties of Mexican Spanish to this region. One further factor making for variety was the absence of Spanish-language authorities in the schools or government (with New Mexico a limited exception) to enforce standards and uniformity.

Southwestern Spanish today includes the well-studied dialect of the ancient New Mexico colony, whose influence also extends into southern Colorado.[8] Far more important in numbers of speakers, however, are the other Spanish dialects of the region, which primarily reflect dialects of the northern and central regions of Mexico, from which the greatest number of recent immigrants have come.[9]

The chief characteristics of Chicano Spanish that distinguish it from the Spanish language south of the border are to be found in the vocabulary: more archaisms (especially in northern New Mexico), and much greater use of English words. Absorbing vocabulary from a politically dominant language seems to be a normal trait, one that was once strikingly exemplified by the English language itself after the con-

quest of England by French-speaking Normans. These are just a few samples of borrowings from English into Southwestern Spanish varieties:

Southern New Mexico, 1950: brecas (brakes), cloche (clutch)[10]

Southwestern states, 1956: suera (sweater), lonchi (lunch), sainiar (to sign), chitiar (to cheat), loviar (to love)[11]

San Antonio, Texas, 1957: pokebuk (pocket book), eswamp (swamp)[12]

Bryan, Texas, 1969: chance (chance), greve (gravy), weldear (to weld), yarda (yard, lawn)[13]

Los Angeles, 1969: plonj (plunge), puchar (push)[14]

Linguists have explored the variety of Spanish dialects of the Southwest in considerable detail.[15] For an understanding of Chicano English, however, it suffices here to make the point that Chicano Spanish derives from Mexico, not Spain, and it frequently uses "nonstandard" features, uninhibited by deference to standards of "correct" Mexican or Peninsular Spanish.[16]

Southwestern English

Anglo English

More directly relevant to an understanding of Chicano English is a knowledge of the Anglo English dialects of the region. These have been studied much less than Southwestern Spanish, even though English speakers outnumber Spanish speakers and have dominated the region for well over a century. Perhaps dialectologists, like others who deal in collectibles, are especially fascinated with the oldest and rarest. But there have been sufficient studies to confirm that the varieties of Anglo English correspond with the varieties of Anglo settlements in the Southwest.

Texas, of course, is not just a southern state but a Southern state. The early Anglo settlers of Texas were from the states of the Old South, and it lined up unwaveringly with the Confederacy during the Civil War. Accordingly, the regional vocabulary of the South, as distinct from that of the Midlands and the North,[17] has been influential in considerable parts of the state. But west of the Pecos River the Southern influence wanes in favor of the Midland. In The Regional Vocabulary of Texas, Atwood gives pallet (bed on the floor), corn shucks, you-all or y'all, pully bone ('wishbone' of a chicken or turkey), light bread (white bread), and snap beans (string beans) as examples of Texas Southernisms collected in the 1950s.[18]

Aside from y'all, however, it is the Southern and South Midland pronunciations rather than the vocabulary that characterize the "Texas accent." Unfortunately, no linguist has ever made a systematic study of the pronunciation of English in the entire state, although a few investigations of individual communities have been undertaken.[19] For example, Texans, like many other Southerners and South Midlanders,

often do not distinguish between short i and e ([ɪ] and [ɛ])[20]* before the nasal consonants [m] and [n]; pin and pen will have identical pronunciations, as will him and hem.

Even more notable as Southern-South Midland characteristics are the long i [aɪ] and ow [aʊ] diphthongs. The diphthong in nine, twice, etc., ends without the clear [ɪ] glide of the northern states; the Southern long i is fronted and has a lengthened simple vowel or an ih glide instead: [a·], [aɨ]. And the diphthong of house, mountain, now, out, etc. begins with the raised, fronted vowel of hat, laugh or something near it ([æ], [a]), instead of the low central vowel of father [ɑ] as spoken far to the north.

Finally, parts of eastern Texas have shared in the Southern [r]-lessness, pronouncing no [r] after vowels in words like poor, card, care. Adopted in Western movies, this is the trait that produces the stereotyped cowboy pronunciations hoss, passel (parcel), or podnuh (partner).

These are some of the pronunciation features to which a Spanish accent could be added to produce a Texas version of Chicano English. As far as the scant evidence reveals, the South Midlands pronunciations extend into Arizona (first settled by Anglos "from the states of the late Confederacy," McWilliams notes)[21] as well as into New Mexico. But the strictly Southern [r]-lessness is likely to be much more limited.

There is a further complication in the English dialect situation in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. Whether through radio and television, or the twentieth-century migration to the Sunbelt of Northern business people, academics, and retirees, or through the influence of earlier settlers from the North, a Northern-North Midland pronunciation is also widely heard in this region. This Northern standard is also easily accessible to Chicanos, and indeed was considered the model followed by certain Chicano speakers of English in San Antonio in the 1950s, as reported in Sawyer's well-known studies.[22] (With appropriate Texan disdain, she labels the Northern pronunciations as "the unnatural, regionless, formal style of the classroom."[23])

Furthermore, the Midlands and Northern postvocalic [r] seems to be gaining over [r]-lessness. For example, a 1971 study found [r]-lessness the "prestige model" only of older people in Austin,[24] and Teschner notes that "San Antonio English was an 'r-less dialect' until quite recently."[25]

California, on the other hand, exhibits Northern and North Midland speech patterns.[26] Although California English is not exactly like that of any other region of the country, its differences from the speech of most of the northern and eastern parts of the country are not obtrusive; in fact, from the start, the English of California seems to have sought the least noticeable compromise between various Northern and Midland pronunciations. As Midlands and Southern immigration has grown in recent decades, the California tendency toward accommodation has persisted. For example, among younger Californians,

*See this note for an explanation of the phonetic symbols used in this paper.

the diphthong of house, now, etc., has in recent years become more raised and fronted, according to the Midland and Southern pattern; but it remains a short, unobtrusive diphthong, unlike the prolonged version of the Midlands and South. Likewise, though younger Californians often will merge short e and i before nasals, as in pen = pin, the vowel remains short and unobtrusive, not diphthongized as in the Midlands and South.[27] Therefore, while Texas is known for its "dialect," California is known for its absence of one. A popular work on linguistics states,

> If you want to hear the general American of the future, Hollywood and TV-studio based, go to California and listen to the speech of the California-born younger generation . . . . Do you recall how in the Presidential campaign of 1960 Kennedy's ahsk and Africar stood out like sore thumbs, while Nixon never drew a lifted eyebrow? Nixon spoke the general American of the future, an American shorn of all local peculiarities.[28]

Nixon did not take special voice lessons to shear his speech of "local pecularities"; he just happened to grow up in southern California. In contrast, the Texas speech of Lyndon Johnson drew frequent notice.

This, then, is the English dialect background of the region: a "Southern accent" in Texas, and to a lesser extent in Arizona and New Mexico, with Northern infiltration in all three states; and a Northern or "general American" pattern of speech in California.

Chicano English

Chicano English adds a "Spanish accent" to a local Anglo variety. The result, as far as we can tell from studies to date, is anything but simple. It appears that there are many possible ways one language can interact with another to produce a distinctive dialect. Furthermore, the great variation in social and linguistic circumstances of Chicanos leads us to expect variety in Chicano English, and variety is in fact what we find when we begin to investigate the subject.

In trying to get a general picture of Chicano English, we are hampered by the limitations of the research reports available to us. No region-wide studies of Chicano English have been conducted, and most of the materials that have been published focus on children of preschool or primary school age. This is an important age for observing the interaction of child and school, but not one from which much can be concluded about the child's future speech patterns or the dialect patterns of the community to which the child belongs. Furthermore, some studies fail to distinguish between Chicanos whose first language is English and those who are in the early stages of learning English as a second language.

Yet despite such limitations, and despite the apparent variety in the manifestations of Chicano English, certain common traits do emerge. To give an idea, then, both of what has been sampled and of the variety of results, this survey will begin with summaries of a number of individual studies,[29] and only then venture to suggest possible common

characteristics. We will begin with those done in California, whose English dialect situation is the least divergent.

California

East Los Angeles, late 1960s. Investigator: Yolanda Lastra de Suárez.[30] Tape-recorded interviews in English with six elementary school children (between kindergarten and fourth grade) of Mexican origin; part of a study focusing on the Spanish of 42 such children, 75 percent of whom were born in the United States and 75 percent of whom were monolingual speakers of Spanish until entering kindergarten. Even at this extreme of the Spanish-English continuum, where the children are only beginning to acquire fluency in English, the language is not simply standard English distorted by Spanish; it seems to be an independent entity that includes elements of the nonstandard speech of monolingual English speakers in Los Angeles.

Pronunciation.

[i] for [ɪ], as in think. Centralized front low vowel, as in [lɑmp] lamp.

Affrication of the palatal fricative, as in cha-les for shades. Fully apical flapped /t/ and /d/ phonemes between vowels, as in lettuce, better, had him. Bilabial (using both lips) instead of labiodental (using lower lip and upper front teeth) fricative: [oβer] (over), [ɑɪ liβ] (I live).[31]

Intonation.

Spanish pattern instead of English, with steadily falling intonation rather than rising-falling as in Anglo dialects.

Syntax.

Misplaced adverbials of time, as in We all the time used to go outside.

Changed order of verb object and adverbial complement: I like to play with my friends Jo and my brother Manuel and my friend Robert and Danny, football.

Lack of verb agreement: She stays home and work.

Past tense in place of infinitive: I used to threw the ball.

Gerund for infinitive: I like to doing math.

Vocabulary.

Spanish lexical interference: Because they are going to operate her (operate on her), My mother works in a fabric (factory), sweet bread (sweet rolls).

Nonstandard usage common to Anglo dialects is also heard, indicating that these children do not learn their English exclusively from schoolteachers: My mother, she doesn't have a job; I like them big whales; Mrs. E. is not teaching no more; You don't do nothing; I also gone with them; I seen them play.

Riverside and vicinity, southern California (60 miles east of Los Angeles), 1970-71. Investigator: Allan Metcalf.[32] Tape-recorded conversations with approximately 36 Chicanos, parents of school-age

children, mostly lower middle-class and natives of the area; predominantly English speaking. The study identified these features as characteristic of Chicano English:

Pronunciation.

Final stop consonants [b], [d], and [g] often lose their voicing. Intervocalic [b] sometimes becomes mildly affricated.

Both these qualities are what one might expect from Spanish influence. But in the case of final [s] before a juncture or pause, quite the opposite occurs to what one would expect. Fluent speakers of Chicano English often used a voiced [z], as in [reɪz] for race or [hawz] for house.

Short and long vowels sound more alike than in other dialects of English, but they remain distinct. Perhaps because the [ɪ] of pin was slightly raised to approach the slightly lowered [i] of bean, there was no merger of the short vowels in pin and pen, as was heard about half the time among young Anglo natives of the area.

Intonation.

This is the "most interesting of all the characteristics of [Chicano] English and the most difficult to describe." In other dialects, a change in the pitch of the voice usually coincides with an increase in loudness to indicate sentence stress. In Chicano English, these two phenomena often do not co-occur, resulting in what sounds to outsiders like two separate points of emphasis.

At the end of a declarative sentence, the pitch and loudness do not fall off as rapidly as in other dialects, sometimes giving an outsider the false impression that the speaker is unfinished, uncertain, or asking a question.

Compound nouns (e.g., minority group) receive stress on the second element, rather than on the first as in most other English dialects.

Vocabulary.

Very little distinctiveness, but a slight inclination to choose items that have parallels in Spanish: sofa rather than couch; wash rather than do the dishes.

Syntax.

No appreciable difference from comparable Anglo dialects.

Redwood City, 1970-72. Investigator: Andrew Cohen.[33] Tapes of stories elicited on a pre- and post-test basis over two years from 90 Mexican-American children, kindergarten through third grade. Half the children were in a bilingual program, but both groups exhibited similar types of deviation from standard English.

Syntax.

A detailed listing of categories and examples of grammatical deviation takes up more than 30 pages of the study (pp. 172-208). The list is too long to be repeated here, but it is a useful one, providing samples of every kind of deviation, even those produced just once by one child. The deviations cover a wide range of grammatical categories, but they do not appear to be simply errors made by second language learners. Interference from Spanish was by no means the only source of deviation; it was calculated to account for about 62 percent of the types of deviations, while developmental errors accounted for 73 percent and nonstandard dialect 27 percent. (Some categories of deviation had more than one possible source; hence the total is greater than 100 percent.)

> Both Bilingual and Comparison groups showed an increase in deviant forms attributable to interference from Spanish, suggesting that the source of deviation in English least susceptible to correction through instruction and maturation is that of interference from Spanish (p. 218).

One may suspect that Spanish-derived deviations are less susceptible to "correction" because they are features of a Chicano English dialect that the children hear from peers in school and the community, and that they accept as a norm.

Los Angeles, 1973. Investigator: Sandre Prasad.[34] Tape-recorded interviews with five first-grade and five sixth-grade Chicanos who attended elementary school in an Anglo neighborhood; all said they spoke some Spanish. Comparisons were made with low-income Anglos and low-income Blacks.

Syntax.

In the first grade, the proportion of nonstandard verb agreement by Chicanos was closer to that of the Blacks; however, in the sixth grade, it was roughly the same as that of the Anglos, who produced fewer nonstandard forms than the Blacks.

Like the Blacks, first-grade Chicanos omitted the -s and -es plural and possessive endings of nouns more frequently than the Anglos, but in the sixth grade, the Chicanos, like the Anglos, omitted hardly any possessives or plurals.

Got was used as a main verb by first graders in all three groups. In the sixth grade, Chicanos and Blacks continued this nonstandard usage, while Anglos avoided it. However, unlike the Blacks, the Chicanos in the sixth grade used the nonstandard inflected Anglo form gots with singular subjects.

Long Beach (20 miles south of Los Angeles), 1973. Investigator: David Thrift.[35] Thrift does not indicate the source of his evidence;

these statements appear in his introduction to a bibliography of Chicano language studies.

Pronunciation.

"Occasional confusion of phonemes that share certain phonetic characteristics, such as /čĕri/ (cherry) for /šĕri/ (Sherry) and vice versa" (p. 3).

"Devoicing of word-final voiced consonants," so that animals ends with [s], dog with [k], and courage with the ch of rich (p. 4).

Stress.

"Mislocation, especially in compounds like bàby-sítter and fíngerprínted and two-word verbs like wáking ùp" (p. 4).

Vocabulary.

"Uses substratum words for Spanish-oriented entities not having direct English lexical equivalents, e.g., barrio, raza, machismo, carnal, atole" (p. 5).

Whittier (15 miles east of Los Angeles), mid-1970s. Investigator: Rosario Gingràs.[36] Tape-recorded interviews with two Chicano married couples, husbands aged 27 and 34, wives 27 and 30; native English speakers, most of whom had never spoken Spanish, although they knew some Spanish expressions.

Pronunciation.

Voiced stop consonants [b], [d], and [g] and fricatives such as [v] and [z] are devoiced in word-final position before a pause: believe [f], tab [p], laid [t], leg [k]. Before a vowel, voiced stops are fricativized--for example, [b] becomes [v]. Before a following consonant, all stops are fricativized--for example, [p] becomes [f]. All consonants assimilate in voicing to a following (nonsonorant) consonant--for example, [s] at the end of one word becomes [z] if the next word starts with [d]. Between vowels, [p] often becomes [f], as in separate, episode.

The pronunciation of /l/ is a notable feature of this dialect. Before vowels, where Spanish has a "light" palatal or front [l], Chicano English has a velarized or back [ɬ]. After vowels the /l/ is not a consonant at all but a glide, either an unrounded back glide or a vowel-like glide similar to [o].[37]

An unstressed vowel comes between an [l] and a preceding stop consonant: place [pəleɬs], please [pəlís].

Unlike other English dialects, but following the pattern of Los Angeles Spanish,[38] this Chicano English has only six vowel phonemes, /i e æ ɑ o u/, with some phonetic variation in the vowels depending on whether they appear in open or closed syllables. Thus fill and feel sound alike, with an [ɪ] realization of the /i/ vowel phoneme, and filling and feeling sound alike, using an [i] realization of the /i/ vowel phoneme. Many other homophones exist in Chicano English as a result of the limited

vowel system, among them coat-caught /kot/, cot-cut /kɑt/ and soot-suit /sut/. The /e/ is a separate vowel from /i/, but frequently raised close to the [ɪ], so the pin-pen distinction is also frequently neutralized, as in local Anglo dialects.

Although there is a clear distinction between /e/ and /æ/, the allocation of words to each vowel does not always accord with that in most other dialects of English. For example, back and bat use /e/ in Chicano English, while bed uses /æ/. Furthermore, /e/ is generally [æ] before /l/ (which, as mentioned above, becomes a glide when not followed by a vowel), as in elevator, bell, hell [xæᵒ]. This behavior of /e/ before /l/ has become one of the most widely recognized traits of a "Chicano accent" in California.

Intonation is strictly Spanish, not English, and a very prominent characteristic of Chicano English. For example, in "Good morning, Mrs. Smith," the pitch falls through the vocative Mrs. Smith without rising again as it would in Anglo dialects.

Arizona

Statewide (25 elementary schools), recorded interviews with 150 Chicano children in grades 3 through 8, late 1930s. Investigator: Klonda Lynn.[39]

Pronunciation.

"Mexican-English" variants do not decrease as speakers increase in age and English language skill. In order of persistence, the Mexican-English features are:

A confusion of sh and ch: one child, for example, pronounced church as shurch, chursh and shursh.

An interchange of [i] and [ɪ], as in Mees for Miss, peach for pitch.

Loss of final [s] and devoicing of [z].

Substitution of [ɑ] for [ʌ], as in [tɑb]ˢ for tub.

The use of Spanish stops for English stops [p], [b], [t], [d], [k], and [g]. Chicano English, for example, uses the less emphatic unaspirated Spanish [p] in words like push. The onset of voicing in the [p] is also earlier than for other English dialects.

The use of the so-called "Castilian" voiced dental-interdental fricative th: [ȣ] for [ð].

Interchange of [U] and [u].

One other characteristic is clipped and rapid speech, with frequent assimilation and conformation of neighboring sounds. For example, about the becomes aboudthe and then abouthe.

New Mexico

Las Vegas, early 1970s. Investigator: Raymond Rodrigues.[40] Taped interviews with 21 bilingual Mexican-American and 16 monolingual Anglo fourth graders, and 19 bilingual Mexican-American and 19 monolingual Anglo ninth graders, along with "in-class free-writings" (p. 6123-A).

Syntax. "The bilingual subjects represent the same language population as the monolingual subjects in their English syntactic usage, except in average clause length in the written mode in ninth grade" (pp. 6123A-6124A).

Texas

San Antonio, mid-1950s. Investigator: Janet Sawyer.[41] Taped interviews with seven native second-generation Spanish speakers. Four of them were skilled enough in English to be called bilinguals even by stringent standards. These were two males, a 32-year-old university graduate and a 21-year-old university student; and two females, a 74-year-old retired seamstress and a 45-year-old housewife who had worked as a salesperson. Seven Anglos were also interviewed.

Pronunciation.

Three of the four bilinguals used the northern diphthongal [ɑɪ] in words like right, nine, five, my, I, nice, iron, tires, while the other bilingual and all the Anglos used the monophthongal [a·] (some of them also manifesting [ɑɪ]). The two older bilinguals used the Northern [ɑU] in cow, house, etc.; the two younger ones used a more fronted [aU]. None of them had the Southern fronted [æU] characteristic of all the Anglo informants (in three cases alternating with [aU]).

The vowel in saw, fog, brought, etc. was monophthongal [ɔ] or even Spanish [o] or [o·] in the speech of the bilinguals, but never the diphthongal [ɔʷ] or [ɔᵒ] found in the speech of the Anglos, especially the older ones. The oldest bilingual showed slight loss of retroflexion in [r] after vowels; the middle-aged housewife usually transferred the Spanish trilled [r] or flap [r] into English. This contrasted with the practice of the three older Anglos, who followed the Southern pattern of not pronouncing [r] after vowels. The young informants, Anglo and Latin alike, had postvocalic [r].

Only one of the four bilinguals had palatalization preceding the /iw/ in new [ɲiw] and tube [ʈiwb], while all the Anglos did.

The Anglos followed the Southern pattern of an up-glide after the short vowel [æᵋ] of bath, pass, calf, dance, cattle, while the bilinguals used the Northern monophthong [æ]. Some of the Anglo speakers merged card and cord, farm and form, etc., using an [ɒ] or [ɔ] before /r/, while all the bilinguals kept [ɑr] and [ɔr] words distinct. As a result, the speech of the bilinguals sounded more Northern (or "unnatural, regionless, formal"[42]) than that of the Anglos.

The most persistent Spanish-feature of the bilinguals' accent was deviation from the usual English distribution of [s] and [z], manifested in devoicing of the [z] of Anglo English at the ends of words. Bilinguals also showed differences in the lower back vowels: [ə] in water and wash, for example, where Anglo speech had [ɒ].

Another difference was the bilinguals' aspiration of [t] and [k] more often and in more environments than the Anglos. Two of the bilinguals also had occasional devoicing of word-final [v] to [f] as in five, twelve.

Stress.

The bilingual speakers often stressed both elements of a compound such as apple tree, while Anglos stressed the first element more strongly. The bilingual housewife had strong stress on the second element of pecan tree, strawberries, White House, storage room.

Verb forms.

The two youngest bilinguals were "very careful to conform to standard [textbook, school, Northern] usage."[43] For example, one of the bilinguals used the Northern hadn't ought to and the other three the Northern should not, while most of the Anglos used the Southern ought not to. One of the younger bilinguals used Northern dove for the past tense of dive, while the others and all Anglos used the Southern dived.

Vocabulary.

The two older bilinguals avoided many Spanish words commonly used by Anglos, such as corral, lariat, and canyon; although the two younger bilinguals often used these words, they stipulated that they would use Anglo pronunciations in English (as would the Anglos, of course). Certain Southern words used by the Anglos were unknown to the bilinguals. These included light bread, corn shucks, pully bone, and snap beans.

The author of these studies has criticized the notion that a Mexican-American dialect of English exists in the Southwest, arguing that "the English spoken by the bilingual informants was simply an imperfect state in the mastery of English" and that "from generation to generation, the second language [English] was in a fluid state, becoming more and more expert. In the community under study for this report, there was no Mexican-American English dialect."[44]

This criticism is open to objection on a number of counts. First, even the most expert English speaker among the bilinguals had distinctively non-Anglo speech. Second, the evidence of the bilinguals' English is ambiguous enough that it can lead to two different conclusions: on the one hand, "it seems reasonable to assume that the model they were striving to attain in English was not Northern or New England speech, or even 'General American,' but simply that variety of American English found in the Anglo community into which they were striving to integrate." On the other hand, "the bilinguals interviewed for this survey (and others observed at various times before and after this survey) had gone even further" in avoiding Spanish words used by Anglos[45]--and also in being "very careful to conform to standard usage."[46] The surprising prevalence of Northern forms, the fact that the two university students "became truly bilingual" only in the Army,[47] the existence of prejudice and discrimination against Chicanos

in San Antonio in the 1950s--all suggest that the models for their English might possibly have included others than the Anglos across town.[48] In fact, the speech norms of the bilinguals are clearly neither entirely Northern nor Southern, nor exactly those of any Anglo group.

More important in weighing the speech of these bilinguals as evidence for or against a Chicano English dialect is the fact that they were all predominantly Spanish speaking, even the most fluent among them. None of them "felt completely at ease in English."[49] What is surprising, therefore, is that even among English speakers who are Spanish-dominant, a norm should emerge that is predictable neither from Spanish interference nor from any single Anglo dialect. It is among the English-dominant succeeding generations that one would have to look for a stable Chicano English dialect.

Fort Worth-Dallas, late 1960s. Investigator: Virgil Poulter.[50] Interviews with eight Chicano college students, aged 18 to 25. Study limited to voiceless stop consonants.

Pronunciation.

"The articulation of the voiceless stops [[p, t, k]] in the Spanish of the bilingual speakers of the Fort Worth-Dallas area seems generally to be unaffected by the articulation of the voiceless stops in English and vice-versa" (p. 47). Word-final stops in English, however, where one might expect the greatest interference,[51] were not studied.

San Antonio, about 1970. Investigators: Diana Natalicio and Frederick Williams.[52] Taped interviews with ten Mexican-American children in kindergarten through second grade, selected from hundreds of recordings made using "sentence repetition test materials." Fourteen experts, "persons whose professional activities showed evidence of interest and expertise in the areas of child language and social dialects," agreed on the following criteria for rating the children's performance in standard English. (It should be emphasized that not all the children showed these characteristics. Rather, they were characteristics that enabled the judges to distinguish one child's performance from another's.)

Pronunciation.

Substitution of ch for sh (washes replaced by watches).

Initial [ð] replaced by [d]: dey for they. Intervocalic [ð] (as in mother) weakened so as to resemble a vowel glide.

Replacement of voiced [z] by [s]: [s] for the final sound of shoes.

Reduction of initial and final consonant clusters: [kuwl] for school.

Substitution of [f] and [s] for [θ]: teef for teeth.

No differentiation among low and central vowels [æ], [ə], [ɑ], and /ɔ/: [ɑ] in brush.

Unaspirated voiceless stops in initial position.

No differentiation between [ɪ] and [i] (as in fit and feet, respectively).

Vowels and vowel glides reduced in length.
Final voiced stops devoiced.

Syntax.

Deletion of inflectional ending indicating third person, present tense of verbs: goes produced as go; helps as help.
Deletion of the noun plural marker: shoes replaced by shoe; use of hyper-plurals: fcets, teeths.
Deletion of the noun possessive marker in pre-noun position: David's neck replaced by David neck.
Substitution of either subject pronoun or article for possessive pronoun: she head or the head for her head.
Replacement of third person singular form has by have or haf.

These were the greatest deviances that the "experts" found in some of the Chicano children's English. But while the experts agreed on these characteristics, they were not able to agree on associating any of the forms with "pathologies," nor could they predict the children's reading achievement.[53] The study thus appears to show that even "experts" cannot consistently find a connection between Chicano English dialects and classroom performance.

Austin, 1971. Investigator: Roger Thompson.[54] Taped interviews with 40 male heads of Spanish-surname households in the largest Mexican-American neighborhood; all were urban second generation, having been raised in Austin. All of them first learned English upon entering elementary school.

Pronunciation.

Nearly half (17) of the speakers had "Spanish-influenced pronunciation," defined (after Sawyer) by devoicing of word-final [z] to [s], as in jazz, analyze, cans, dishes, goes, depends. Devoicing "seemed to predict the presence of other features of Mexican-American 'accent'" (p. 20). The article does not specify which other features it predicts.

All but three of these speakers used the Northern (or Spanish-influenced) [ɑɪ] in five, fine, etc., while Anglo speakers in Austin would have a fronted [a] or [aɪ].

Of the 23 who did not devoice final [z], 11 used the Northern [ɑɪ], and 12 used the Southern (and local Anglo) [aɪ] or [a]. Since the study focused on just two phonological features and their social correlations and did not include any Anglos for comparison, it makes no further mention of ways in which the varieties of Mexican-American English might differ from the English of local Anglos.

The Nature of Chicano English

Is it possible to reach any sort of accurate conclusions about the linguistic features of Chicano English from the scattered evidence surveyed above?[55] In trying to answer this question, we are in the

position of a cartographer attempting to draw an accurate map of the New World from the reports of the first explorers. A few main features would be clear--a bay and river here, a sandy beach there, a mountain yonder, and above all, the fact of the land itself, which unexpectedly emerges as a new entity, not just a part of India or China. But the detailed topography, and the question of whether the new land was a single mass or a series of islands, would be at best matters for educated guessing and further exploration--as would the details of its extent and configuration.

Our knowledge of Chicano English is similarly limited and preliminary. Yet it does seem safe to conclude that Chicano English is not just a familiar part of the English or Spanish languages, but a new world of its own, a world with something of the variety Columbus found in his.

We can say, first of all, that there remain a great many Chicanos in the Southwest whose English is a second language, often learned at school (but not just from teachers), starting in kindergarten. These are the Chicanos for whom bilingual programs are intended, the Chicanos whose English shows the flaws to be expected from first language interference in pronunciation, syntax, and idiom.

Yet by the time researchers get around to interviewing these Chicanos in the schools or later in life, if they speak English at all, they seem considerably past the severe interference stage.[56] Comparing the structure of Spanish with that of English, one could predict marked deviations from Anglo norms in pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax; but most of the deviations actually encountered seem to be in pronunciation, very few in syntax, and even fewer in vocabulary. Consider these deviant sentences predicted in one lengthy description of Spanish-influenced English,[57] but not attested in any of the actual reports of Chicano English:

> Omitted subject pronoun: Is a man (he is a man).[58]
>
> No in a double negative: Sarah no talk to no one.
>
> "Typical Spanish-type questions" (p. 356): Is round this? (is this round?)
>
> Contractions not allowed in other dialects: Yes, I'm (yes, I am).
>
> Transitive verbs with prepositional phrases for objects: Bill saw to Mary (Bill saw Mary).

Vocabulary, as well, has potential for Spanish influence that we do not find realized:

> Inanimate objects referred to as she or he: she for table, and he for book.

Chicanos who speak English do not seem to talk like that. Even the Spanish-dominant Chicano English speakers do not by any means display all the language-learning errors one would expect of a Spanish speaker learning English for the first time in a classroom. They hear enough English outside the classroom, apparently, to insure that in syntactic

structure and vocabulary their English is much like that of Anglos. The one area of distinctiveness is the surface manifestation of language--the pronunciation. And even the pronunciation of Spanish-dominant Chicano speakers of English is never reported as entirely Spanish, except in intonation. There is no report, for example, of a Chicano English dialect with only five distinct vowels, as in Spanish, although there are sometimes not the full ten or eleven distinct vowels of Anglo dialects.

All this can be said about the English of Chicano speakers who are unquestionably Spanish-influenced. It can likewise be said with even more assurance about another type of Chicano English speaker--one who by every report is growing rapidly in numbers[59] and is soon likely to predominate over the former kind. This is the Chicano whose first language as a child, and primary language as an adult, is English--one for whom a bilingual program would be a bafflement, or at best an introduction to a language (Spanish) that he would not otherwise command. Regrettably, the English-only Chicano has scarcely been studied. So though we know that the Spanish-dominant speaker's language can be related to educational difficulties in English-speaking schools, we have no evidence regarding the educational success of the English monolingual who speaks with a "Spanish accent." We can surmise that the educational difficulties of these speakers would be appreciably less than for the Spanish-dominant speakers.

We also know that the English-only Chicano speakers who reside in Chicano neighborhoods may speak English in a manner that distinguishes them from residents of Anglo neighborhoods and associates them with the Spanish-speaking residents of the Chicano neighborhoods. Whether it will continue to exist in the distant future or not, it is hard to find grounds for denying the recognition of Chicano English as a dialect of English.

We return, then, to the problem with which this paper began. If the Chicano English dialect sounds like the Spanish-influenced English of those learning English as a second language, how can teachers and administrators distinguish between the two? A rough answer seems available to us.

1. When the Spanish influence extends to vocabulary, idiom, or syntax to any notable degree, the speaker is likely to have English as a second language only. Bilingual teaching strategies, based on understanding of the contrasts between Spanish and English, are appropriate for such students.

2. When the Spanish influence is confined to the intonation pattern and the pronunciation of consonants and vowels, but does not result in un-English word choice or syntax, the student is more likely to be a native speaker of English.

As the summaries of studies make clear, the exact nature of the pronunciation features that characterize this second and more prevalent condition, a Chicano English dialect, will vary not only from one community to another, but also within a community among people of various groups and ages. The variation among speakers of different ages is further complicated by the normal stages of language develop-

ment. Still, certain features seem widely reported and perhaps especially characteristic of the phenomenon of Chicano English.

Spanish intonation pattern: less extreme changes of pitch and stress, more even timing of syllables than in Anglo dialects; a slighter falling off at the end of declarative sentences and wh-questions. Compound nouns stressed on second rather than first element.[60]

Devoicing of word-final consonants, especially [z] to [s]. Substitution of ch [č] for sh [š] and vice versa.

Reduction of vowel contrasts, especially among the high vowels [i] - [ɪ] and [u] - [U]. Confusion of this and these is reported as a notable spelling problem for Chicano college students in Edinburg, Texas, for example.[61]

Substitution of a low vowel [ɑ] or [a] for the schwa [ə], as in {tɑb} for tub.

School authorities will find that the dialect of this sort of speaker will cause a problem only if they let it become one. For example, the teacher of reading must have sufficient understanding of the students' dialect so as to avoid labeling dialect pronunciations as reading errors. If soot comes out as suit, the teacher will need to know that the student still can be recognizing the letters s-o-o-t as describing a covering of grime, not of clothing. Similarly, the teacher may need to recognize more homonyms than in Anglo dialects. (We spell the [sut] you want off you as soot, and the [sut] you want on you as suit.)

To avoid such difficulties, should the schools attempt to teach speakers of Chicano English to speak a second dialect, Anglo English? Wouldn't that also be a way of helping Chicanos cross the barriers of prejudice into the mainstream? The answer is a clear NO. First of all, there is no evidence that dialect itself is the reason for prejudice, although it may be the excuse. But, more importantly, it would do no good. The schools cannot possibly spare the time for the intensive training needed to revise a speaker's entire phonetic inventory; even Henry Higgins needed several months of Eliza Doolittle's undivided attention in his one-on-one tutorial. The choice of dialect must be left to the individual student, who can--if he or she wishes--adopt a new style by taking a different model. Hearing several varieties of language--from parents and siblings, from teachers, from television and radio, and from peers--the child will take one pattern for a model, and that pattern is usually neither parents nor teachers, nor television or radio broadcasters, but the persons most closely resembling what the child is or wants to be--classmates and slightly older children. The schools (along with radio and television) do all they should--and can--do by providing alternate models for the students to consider.[62]

If this essay dealt with the Spanish language ability of young Chicanos, it would have to be deeply pessimistic. Study after study suggests that--except in communities right along the border--fewer Chicanos are growing up with a command of the Spanish language, even if they began school as Spanish monolinguals. Ironically, this may be the result of more enlightened attitudes toward foreign languages on

the part of school authorities. For as long as Spanish was strictly prohibited in the schools, a neat division of function was consequently enforced: English for school and interaction with the Anglo community, Spanish for home and neighborhood. Once the use of Spanish became tolerated in school--if not always enthusiastically accepted--many students lost their enthusiasm for it.

Another factor contributing to the diminution of Spanish proficiency may be the easing of discrimination that once successfully isolated Chicanos into Spanish-speaking communities. Though much remains to be done before discrimination comes close to vanishing, the days are long gone when stores could display signs reading "White Trade Only,"[63] and employers could have two wage scales for the same work--one for Anglos and one for Mexicans. In government, as in the schools, a more positive attitude toward foreign languages is emerging: telephone dialing instructions, ballots, and public health pamphlets are now appearing in Spanish. Through such means, for the first time in a century, Anglo residents of California and other southwestern states can hardly escape noticing that many Spanish speakers are in their midst. But because Spanish for many Chicano children is now a language used in schools and in government, just like English, it may be that they have less of a sense of a distinctive place for Spanish, and less of an inclination to maintain it.

So when the schools made a special point of prohibiting Spanish, it persisted; today, when the schools have begun to recognize the child's Spanish linguistic resources, the Spanish language seems to be retreating. Whether the schools have had any effect on this trend is not clear, but it is clear that by and large the schools have not had the effect they intended. Again, the lesson for teachers and administrators should be clear: the school cannot effect changes in a child's spoken language against the child's inclination, nor can it impede changes a child is determined to make, except in such minutiae as the pronunciation of a single word or the use of one verb form in place of another--and even then the learned usage may be confined to the classroom, if it conflicts with the practice of the child's peers.

As far as spoken language is concerned, the schools can and should provide models of formal and public language, but they should not waste time trying to change a child's dialect. Nothing short of a fully residential school, which would isolate the child from peers in the community, could hope to do that. What the school can reasonably undertake is to teach the child to read and write by relating the child's variety of spoken English to the standard written forms. This calls for an extra effort of understanding on the part of the teacher, who must be able to distinguish misreadings from normal dialect forms, and who in explaining standard written English must begin with forms the child actually makes use of. In the case of Chicano English, this special effort is most likely to relate to pronunciation. A Chicano English speaker may well have more homophones than an Anglo, such as heap and hip; the teacher will have to explain that the ea spelling goes with the word that means 'a pile,' the i spelling with the word that refers to 'a part of the body.' This task is no different from explaining bare and bear, rode and road, read (past tense) and red. Indeed, some speakers of Chicano English may have less trouble than Anglos in learning that wars, walls and runs end with s, not z.

The teacher's task, then, is (1) to see if behind a Spanish accent English fluency may be lurking--even English monolingualism; (2) to allow a Chicano child's English fluency to develop without making fruitless attempts to modify the pronunciation; and (3) to recognize this fluency as a dialect of English capable of being related to the standard form of writing just like the many other varieties of English spoken around the globe. In short, treat the various manifestations of Chicano English as dialects of English, because that is what they are.

NOTES

[1]Neither Chicano nor Mexican-American is completely satisfactory for describing people with these characteristics; the preferred term seems to vary from place to place, between young and old, and over the course of years. I have used Chicano in the title of this paper, following the recent practice of linguists, e.g., Eduardo Hernández-Chávez, Andrew D. Cohen and Anthony F. Beltramo, editors of El lenguaje de los Chicanos (Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975). But other designations will also be used when they better reflect the attitudes of a researcher or of a community being studied. For discussions of the terms Chicano, Mexican-American, Mexican, Hispano, Spanish American, etc., see Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore and Ralph C. Guzman, The Mexican-American people (New York: Free Press, 1970), 385-87 (published before the use of Chicano became widespread); David Thrift, Mexican American language studies: A bibliographical survey, 1896-1973, California State University, Fullerton, Department of Linguistics, Seminar Papers series 29 (1973), 2-3; Jack D. Forbes, Aztecas del norte: The Chicanos of Aztlán (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1973), 149-73 (a militant view); Lurline H. Coltharp, "Pachuco, Tirilón, and Chicano," American Speech 50 (Spring-Summer 1975), 25-29; Spanish and English of United States Hispanos: A critical, annotated, linguistic bibliography, ed. Richard V. Teschner, Garland D. Bills and Jerry R. Craddock (Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975), xi.

[2]For example, in William Labov, The study of nonstandard English (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970), 5; Jean Malmstrom and Constance Weaver, Transgrammar: English structure, style, and dialects (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1973), 350-60; Roger M. Thompson, "Mexican-American English: Social correlates of regional pronunciation," American Speech 50 (Spring-Summer 1975), 18-24.

[3]Code-switching, or the frequent shifting between Spanish and English even within sentences, is widespread among bilingual Chicanos. See, for example, Donald M. Lance, "Spanish-English code switching," 138-53, and John J. Gumperz and Eduardo Hernández-Chávez, "Cognitive aspects of bilingual communication," in El lenguaje (see note 1), 154-63; and Guadalupe Valdés-Fallis, Code switching and the classroom teacher (Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics/ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, 1978).

[4]As in Carey McWilliams, North from Mexico: The Spanish-speaking people of the United States (New York: Greenwood, 1968).

[5]As in Forbes, Aztecas del norte (see note 1).

[6]Janet B. Sawyer, "Spanish-English bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas," in El lenguaje, 78.

[7]See McWilliams, North from Mexico, 24, 63, and passim.

[8]See Teschner et al., Spanish and English (see note 1), xi-xii.

[9]For a brief overview of Chicano Spanish and its relation to other North American varieties, see Daniel N. Cárdenas, Dominant Spanish dialects spoken in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970). A portion of this study also appears in El lenguaje, 1-5.

[10]Jacob Ornstein, "The archaic and the modern in the Spanish of New Mexico," in El lenguaje, 9.

[11]Aurelio M. Espinosa, Jr., "Problemas lexicográficos del español del sudoeste," in El lenguaje, 16.

[12]Janet B. Sawyer, "Social aspects of bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas," in Readings in American dialectology, ed. Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), 380.

[13]Donald M. Lance, "Dialectal and nonstandard forms in Texas Spanish," in El lenguaje, 47-49.

[14]Yolanda Lastra de Suárez, "El habla y la educación de los niños de origen mexicano en Los Angeles," in El lenguaje, 64.

[15]See Teschner et al., Spanish and English, for a thorough survey of studies, and El lenguaje for a good sampling of them.

[16]Written Spanish does not exert much of a normative force in the Southwest, in contrast to its role in countries where Spanish is the official language. The Mexican-Americans "were isolated from the literate tradition in Spanish, whether of Spain or Latin America," note Grebler et al., The Mexican-American People (see note 1), 432.

[17]For delineation of the principal eastern dialect regions of the United States--which extend roughly westward to the Rockies, with turns and interminglings--see, for example, Hans Kurath, A word geography of the eastern United States, Studies in American English 1 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949); and Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., The pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states, Studies in American English 3 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961).

[18]E. Bagby Atwood, The regional vocabulary of Texas (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962), 83, 86.

[19]For example, Sawyer (see note 6); Arthur Norman, "A southeast Texas dialect study," in Readings in American dialectology (see note 12), 135-51; Carmelita Klipple, "The speech of Spicewood, Texas," in A various language: Perspectives on American dialects, ed. Juanita V.

Williamson and Virginia M. Burke (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 329-34.

[20]The modified IPA system of phonetic transcription followed more or less closely by most of the studies reported here is described in great detail in Hans Kurath, Handbook of the linguistic geography of New England, 2nd ed. (New York: AMS Press, 1973), 122-46. In most Northern and California Anglo dialects, the following words will exemplify the vowel sounds indicated by the symbols:

[i] beet	[ɨ]	[u] boot	[aɪ] bite
[ɪ] bit		[U] put	[aU] bout
[e] bait	[ʌ] or [ə] but	[o] boat	[ɚ] or [ɝ] bird
[ɛ] bet			
[æ] bat [a]	[ɑ] pot [ɒ]	[ɔ] bought	

Symbols without sample words have values close to those of adjacent symbols. A dot · indicates a lengthened sound. Brackets [ ] are used to enclose phonetic symbols in discussions of individual sounds. But when an author is concerned with the overall (phonemic) pattern of distinctive sounds in a particular language or dialect, the symbol for each such sound will be enclosed in slant lines / / rather than brackets, to indicate that native speakers perceive it as distinctive. Thus, to use the example here, in Northern dialects [ɪ] and [ɛ] before [n] belong to the separate phonemes /ɪ/ and /ɛ/ respectively, but in many Southern dialects they can be variant manifestations (allophones) of the phoneme /ɛ/.

[21]North from Mexico, 83.

[22]See notes 6 and 12.

[23]Sawyer, in El lenguaje, 77.

[24]Maverick M. Harris, "The retroflexion of postvocalic /r/ in Austin," American Speech 44 (Winter 1969), 263-71.

[25]Teschner, in Spanish and English, 195.

[26]For studies of California vocabulary, see David W. Reed, "Eastern dialect words in California," in Allen and Underwood, Readings in American dialectology, 105-14; Elizabeth S. Bright, A word geography of California and Nevada, University of California Publications in Linguistics 69 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); Carroll E. Reed and David W. Reed, "Problems of English speech mixture in California and Nevada," in Studies in linguistics in honor of Raven I. McDavid, Jr., ed. Lawrence M. Davis (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1972), 135-43.

[27]Allan A. Metcalf, "Directions of change in southern California English," Journal of English Linguistics 6 (March 1972), 28-34.

[28]Mario Pei, The many hues of English (New York: Knopf, 1967), 192.

[29]This is a representative sampling rather than an exhaustive review of studies of Chicano English. Several dozen additional studies have been made, with results not notably different from those reviewed here. For listings and detailed discussion of many of those studies, including some that are not easily accessible, see Teschner et al., Spanish and English. Additional listings, without annotation, appear in Garland D. Bills, Jerry R. Craddock and Richard V. Teschner, "Current research on the language(s) of U.S. Hispanos," Hispania 60 (1977), 347-58.

[30]Lastra de Suárez, in El lenguaje, 61-69.

[31]The article gives [liβo] for live, but the final [o], which receives no comment, appears to be a typographical error.

[32]Allan A. Metcalf, "Mexican-American English in southern California," Western Review 9 (Spring 1972), 13-21. Supplementary notes in Allan A. Metcalf, "The study (or, non-study) of California Chicano English," in Southwest Areal Linguistics, ed. Garland D. Bills (San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism, School of Education, San Diego State University, 1974), 97-106.

[33]Andrew D. Cohen, A sociolinguistic approach to bilingual education: Experiments in the American Southwest (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975).

[34]Sandre Prasad, Syntactic variation in the speech of Mexican-American children (paper presented at the Pacific Coast regional meeting of the American Dialect Society, Los Angeles, 1974).

[35]Thrift, Mexican American language studies (see note 1), 3-5.

[36]Rosario C. Gingràs, Rule innovation in hispanicized English, (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Dialect Society, Washington, D.C., 1978).

[37]Sawyer found word-final /1/ realized as [U] or [ə] among younger Anglos and Chicanos alike in San Antonio, Texas (see El lenguaje, 91-92).

[38]The standard study of Los Angeles Spanish finds just five vowel phonemes: /i e ɑ o u/. See Robert N. Phillips, Jr., "The segmental phonology of Los Angeles Spanish," in Studies in southwest Spanish, ed. J. Donald Bowen and Jacob Ornstein (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1976), 82-83. But Phillips did find [æ] occasionally for /ɑ/ (see El lenguaje, 59).

[39]Klonda Lynn, "Bilingualism in the Southwest," Quarterly Journal of Speech 31 (1945), 175-80. Some details also come from Teschner et al., Spanish and English, 128-29.

[40]Raymond J. Rodrigues, "A comparison of the written and oral English syntax of Mexican American bilingual and Anglo American monolingual fourth and ninth grade students (Las Vegas, New Mexico)," Dissertation Abstracts International 35 (March 1975), 6123A-24A.

[41]Sawyer (see notes 6 and 12).

[42]Sawyer, in El lenguaje, 77.

[43]Sawyer, in A various language, 579.

[44]Sawyer, in El lenguaje, 78.

[45]Sawyer, in Readings in American dialectology, 378-79.

[46]Sawyer, in El lenguaje, 96.

[47]Ibid., 93.

[48]A more recent study indicates that "Yankee" norms are to be found among Anglo San Antonians too. In fact, there are apparently three different Anglo dialects: a Southern one, a standardized (or Northern) one, and a blended (perhaps South Midlands) one. The different dialects predominate in different neighborhoods. See Scott Baird, English monolingualism in San Antonio, (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Dialect Society, Chicago, 1977).

[49]Sawyer, in Readings in American dialectology, 377.

[50]Virgil L. Poulter, "Comparison of voiceless stops in the English and Spanish of bilingual natives of Fort Worth-Dallas," in Texas studies in bilingualism: Spanish, French, German, Czech, Polish, Sorbian, and Norwegian in the Southwest, ed. Glenn G. Gilbert, Studia linguistica germanica, 3 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970), 42-49.

[51]Compare, for example, Sawyer's report in El lenguaje, 90, of aspirated [t'] and [k'] occasionally in final position before a pause in the speech of the bilinguals she studied, but not in the speech of the Anglos.

[52]Diana S. Natalicio and Frederick Williams, "What characteristics can 'experts' reliably evaluate in the speech of Black and Mexican-American children?" TESOL Quarterly 6 (June 1972), 121-27.

[53]On a scale ranging from 0.0 (no reliability) to 1.0 (perfect reliability), the experts' evaluations of language features were in the high range: .95 for English comprehension (good-bad), .94 for English production (good-bad), and so on. In contrast, the reliability estimate for pathologies (yes-no) was .19, and for predicting reading achievement (yes-no) was 0.0.

[54]Thompson, "Mexican-American English: Social correlates . . ." (see note 2).

[55]One reviewer of El lenguaje de los Chicanos states flatly that the evidence is too meager and scattered for any conclusions: "The lack of cumulation of knowledge regarding the language usage of Chicanos prevents one from being able to make any generalizable statements about the different varieties of language use, and also from being able to compare the regional variations of language use." Adalberto Aguirre, Jr., "The review as social commentary," Language in Society 6 (December 1977), 393.

[56]In addition to the studies summarized in this article, many others have dealt with Chicanos from Spanish-speaking backgrounds in the schools, and found only minor differences between their language performance and that of English-background Chicanos or Anglos. See, for example, the studies by Schupp and van Metre annotated in Spanish and English, 113, 130-31; Marilyn S. Lucas and Harry Singer, "Dialect in relation to oral reading achievement: Recoding, encoding, or merely a code?" Journal of Reading Behavior 7 (Summer 1975), 137-48; M. Irene Stephens, "Elicited imitation of selected features of two American English dialects in Head Start children," Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 19 (1976), 493-508.

[57]Malmstrom and Weaver, Transgrammar (see note 2), 350-60.

[58]One possible instance of this sort of omission was reported in Cohen, A sociolinguistic approach to bilingual education, 177. It occurred once in the 360 tape-recorded stories told by kindergarten through third grade Chicano children in Redwood City, California: "Then _____ puts this in the pants." But the presence of an adverb at the start of the sentence makes it different from "Is a man."

[59]See, for instance, Rosaura Sánchez, "Chicano bilingualism," New Scholar 6 (1977), 209-25. (Census statistics "reflect dynamic bilingualism, especially among the younger population, with a language shift from Spanish to English as the usual language among at least half of the 11 million persons of Spanish origin. At least 3 million of these, it would appear, are no longer using the Spanish language at all," 219.)

[60]An interchange of primary and secondary stresses in words other than compounds also has been observed. See discussion of Heiler-Saavedra in Spanish and English, 203-4.

[61]Paul Willcott, "Differences in English dictation response by Spanish speakers and by English speakers," in Southwest areal linguistics (see note 32), 309-15.

[62]For discussion of the linguistic models children follow, and whether the schools can or should intervene, see William Labov, The study of nonstandard English (see note 2).

[63]For extensive discussion of discrimination, see McWilliams, North from Mexico, 195 and passim.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Documents identified by an ED number may be read on microfiche at an ERIC library collection or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.

The notation "T p. XX" at the end of an entry refers to discussion of the item in the bibliography by Teschner et al. listed in the first section below.

Bibliographies and Surveys

Aguirre, Adalberto, Jr. 1977. The review as social commentary. Language in Society 6 (December): 391-402.

Review of Hernández-Chávez et al., El lenguaje de los Chicanos.

Bills, Garland D., Jerry R. Craddock and Richard V. Teschner. 1977. Current research on the language(s) of U.S. Hispanos. Hispania 60: 347-58.

Continues Teschner et al., listing 253 items published between January 1974 and January 1977. No annotation or categorization.

Bills, Garland D. and Jacob Ornstein. 1976. Linguistic diversity in southwest Spanish. In Bowen and Ornstein, Studies in southwest Spanish, 4-16.

Estimates numbers and proportions of English and Spanish speakers in the Southwest.

Bowen, J. Donald and Jacob Ornstein, eds. 1976. Studies in southwest Spanish. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Contains important, data-rich studies.

Gingràs, Rosario C. 1973. The Mexican-American preschool child: A report on current research. In Bilingual children: A resource document, ed. Muriel Saville-Troike, Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education series, 2. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, Appendix A, 51-78. Also ED 102 867.

Annotated, critical bibliography of studies since 1950 of children aged 3 to 6.

Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo, Andrew D. Cohen and Anthony F. Beltramo, eds. 1975. El lenguaje de los Chicanos. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics. Also ED 130 504.

Twenty studies, most of them dealing with Chicano Spanish, but some with reference to Chicano English. Unexcelled and essential as an introduction to the field. Includes a 350-item bibliography.

Labov, William. 1970. The study of nonstandard English. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English. ED 024 053.

Although this book barely mentions "Spanish-influenced English," it remains the best source of practical advice on how to investigate children's nonstandard speech and how to deal with it in the classroom.

Peñalosa, Fernando. 1979. Chicano sociolinguistics: A brief introduction. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

According to the publisher, discusses "the linguistic, sociological, anthropological, and educational implications of Chicano bilingualism." (New; not seen.)

Teschner, Richard V., Garland D. Bills and Jerry R. Craddock. 1975. Spanish and English of United States Hispanos: A critical, annotated, linguistic bibliography. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics. Also ED 108 515.

An essential and central volume. Contains 675 entries, most of them annotated and evaluated at considerable length. Locates and reports on some almost inaccessible items, e.g., unpublished M.A. theses.

Thrift, David. 1974. Mexican American language studies: A bibliographical survey, 1896-1973. California State University, Fullerton, Department of Linguistics, Seminar Papers series 29.

Contains 168 entries, many with detailed annotation and evaluation.

Chicanos: Historical and Social Studies

Forbes, Jack D. 1973. Aztecas del norte: The Chicanos of Aztlán. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett.

Militant, mythical, poetic.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. The Mexican-American people: The nation's second largest minority. New York: Free Press.

Includes results of surveys in San Antonio and Los Angeles. (T p. 39)

McWilliams, Carey. 1968. North from Mexico: The Spanish-speaking people of the United States. New York: Greenwood. (Reprint of the 1st ed. [1949] with a new introduction.)

An engaged but even-tempered account of the historical and social origins of today's Chicanos. (T p. 61)

Sánchez, Rosaura. 1977. Chicano bilingualism. New Scholar 6: 209-25.

Thompson, Roger M. 1974. The 1970 U.S. census and Mexican American language loyalty: A case study. In Southwest areal linguistics, ed. Garland D. Bills, 65-78. Also in International Journal of the Sociology of Language 2 (equivalent to Linguistics 128): 7-18.

Anglo Dialects of English

Atwood, E. Bagby. 1953. A survey of verb forms in the eastern United States. Studies in American English 2. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

_____. 1962. The regional vocabulary of Texas. Austin: University of Texas Press. (T pp. 196-97)

Bright, Elizabeth S. 1971. A word geography of California and Nevada. University of California Publications in Linguistics 69. Berkeley: University of California Press. (T p. 219)

Harris, Maverick M. 1969. The retroflexion of postvocalic /r/ in Austin. American Speech 44 (4): 263-71.

Kurath, Hans. 1949. A word geography of the eastern United States. Studies in American English 1. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

_____ and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. 1961. The pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states. Studies in American English 3. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Metcalf, Allan A. 1972. Directions of change in southern California English. Journal of English Linguistics 6 (March): 28-34.

Reed, Carroll E. 1977. Dialects of American English. 2nd ed. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

_____ and David W. Reed. 1972. Problems of English speech mixture in California and Nevada. In Studies in linguistics in honor of Raven I. McDavid, Jr., ed. Lawrence M. Davis. University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 135-43.

Reed, David W. 1954. Eastern dialect words in California. Publication of the American Dialect Society 21 (April): 3-15.

Cárdenas, Daniel N. 1970. Dominant Spanish dialects spoken in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. ED 042 137. One section on Mexican Spanish reprinted in Hernández-Chávez et al., El lenguaje de los Chicanos, 1-5.

An overview. (T p. 8)

_____. 1975. Chicano language: What? why? how? Hispania 58 (March): 185-88.

Carrow, Elizabeth. 1972. Auditory comprehension of English by monolingual and bilingual preschool children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 15: 407-12.

Results of survey of poverty-level children aged 3 years, 10 months to 6 years, 9 months at day care centers in Houston--30 monolingual Anglos, 30 bilingual Mexican-Americans. On an auditory comprehension test, bilinguals did significantly worse, except in the oldest group. A significantly greater number of errors in nouns, pronouns, noun number, and noun phrase with adjective modifiers were made by bilingual children than by monolingual children. (T pp. 176-77)

Cohen, Andrew D. 1975. A sociolinguistic approach to bilingual education: Experiments in the American Southwest. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Chapter 8, "Deviations from school English and Spanish grammar," appears as "The English and Spanish grammar of Chicano primary school students" in Bowen and Ornstein, Studies in southwest Spanish, 125-64.

García, Ricardo L. 1974. Toward a grammar of Chicano English. English Journal 63 (March): 34-38.

Like his College English article the following year, which repeats much of this one, this article provides illuminating--but not abundant--examples and anecdotes rather than a comprehensive statement.

_____. 1975. A linguistic frame of reference for critiquing Chicano compositions. College English 37 (October): 184-88.

Johnson, Edith Trager and Frank Abraham. 1973. Basic English and Spanish syntax of Spanish-speaking Americans: Some interactions and implications. In Readings in Spanish-English linguistics, ed. Rose Nash. Hato Rey, P.R.: Inter American University Press, 72-122.

A study of 40 Spanish-speaking children in Santa Barbara and Goleta, California--half first graders, half in junior high school; half of them recent arrivals from Mexico. The researchers found three principal areas of difficulty in spoken English syntax: subject-verb agreement, pronouns, and verb phrases.

Lastra de Suárez, Yolanda. 1975. El habla y la educación de los niños de origen mexicano en Los Angeles. In Hernández-Chávez et al., El lenguaje de los Chicanos, 61-69.

Lucas, Marilyn S. and Harry Singer. 1975. Dialect in relation to oral reading achievement: Recoding, encoding, or merely a code? Journal of Reading Behavior 7 (Summer): 137-48.

Lynn, Klonda. 1945. Bilingualism in the Southwest. Quarterly Journal of Speech 31: 175-80. (T pp. 129-30)

Malmstrom, Jean and Constance Weaver. 1973. Transgrammar: English structure, style, and dialects. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Gives abundant examples of characteristics that one might expect to find in Spanish-influenced English, based on comparison of the structures of English and Spanish. Most of the syntactical items, however, have not been reported in Chicano English.

Metcalf, Allan A. 1972. Mexican-American English in southern California. Western Review (Silver City, N.M.) 9 (Spring): 13-21. (T p. 226)

Natalicio, Diana S. and Frederick Williams. 1972. What characteristics can "experts" reliably evaluate in the speech of Black and Mexican-American children? TESOL Quarterly 6 (June): 121-27.

Politzer, Robert L. and Arnulfo G. Ramírez. 1973. An error analysis of the spoken English of Mexican-American pupils in a bilingual school and a monolingual school. Language Learning 23: 39-62. ED 073 879.

A study of 1,000 errors in the speech of 120 Mexican-American children, kindergarten through third grade, taped in Redwood City, California. The most common error is the wrong use of the simple past tense; substitution of the simple verb form for the past tense of regular verbs may result from Spanish-influenced misinterpretation of final consonant clusters. The errors "represent stages in the acquisition of English" and "are probably not part of a stable linguistic system used by the community." (T p. 227)

Poulter, Virgil L. 1970. Comparison of voiceless stops in the English and Spanish of bilingual natives of Fort Worth-Dallas. In Texas studies in bilingualism: Spanish, French, German, Czech, Polish, Sorbian, and Norwegian in the Southwest, ed. Glenn G. Gilbert. Studia linguistica germanica, 3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 42-49. (T pp. 166-67)

Rodrigues, Raymond J. 1974. A comparison of the written and oral English syntax of Mexican American bilingual and Anglo American monolingual fourth and ninth grade students (Las Vegas, New Mexico). Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico. Dissertation Abstracts International 35 (March 1975): 6123A-24A. See ED 111 027.

Sawyer, Janet B. 1959. Aloofness from Spanish influence in Texas English. Word 15 (August): 270-81. Reprinted as "The speech of San Antonio, Texas" in A various language: Perspectives on American dialects, ed. Juanita V. Williamson and Virginia M. Burke. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, 309-28. (T p. 207)

_____. 1964. Social aspects of bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas. Publication of the American Dialect Society 41, 7-15. Reprinted in

Readings in American dialectology, ed. Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971, 375-81. (T pp. 207-8)

Sawyer, Janet B. 1970. Spanish-English bilingualism in San Antonio, Texas. In Gilbert, Texas studies . . ., 18-41. Reprinted in Hernández-Chávez et al., El lenguaje . . ., 77-98. (T p. 208)

Stephens, M. Irene. 1976. Elicited imitation of selected features of two American English dialects in Head Start children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 19: 493-508.

Thompson, Roger M. 1975. Mexican-American English: Social correlates of regional pronunciation. American Speech 50 (Spring-Summer): 18-24.

Valdés-Fallis, Guadalupe. 1978. Code switching and the classroom teacher, Language in Education series 4. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics/ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. ED 153 506.

Describes code switching among Chicanos and its varying characteristics in detail, and discusses the importance of the teacher's attitude toward this linguistic process.

Vallejo, Bernardo. 1976. Linguistic and socio-economic correlations in the spoken language of Mexican-American children. In Bowen and Ornstein, Studies in Southwest Spanish, 165-82.

Results of a study conducted in San Antonio in 1971.

Willcott, Paul. 1974. Differences in English dictation response by Spanish speakers and by English speakers. In Southwest areal linguistics, ed. Garland D. Bills. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism, School of Education, San Diego State University, 309-15. (T p. 209)

Allan A. Metcalf (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley) is Associate Professor of English at MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois. He is the author of *Riverside English: The Spoken Language of a Southern California Community* (University of California, Riverside, 1971; ED 071 464) and, with David W. Reed, of *A Guide to the California-Nevada Field Records of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast* (Microforms Division, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 1978). Since 1976 Prof. Metcalf has been editor of the *Newsletter of the American Dialect Society*.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Volume 1 (1977-78)

1. *Directory of Foreign Language Service Organizations*, by Sophia Behrens. $3.95. (ED 153 503)

2. *The Linguist in Speech Pathology*, by Walt Wolfram. $2.95. (ED 153 504)

3. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1976-77*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95. (ED 153 505)

4. *Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher*, by Guadalupe Valdés-Fallis. $2.95. (ED 153 506)

5. *Current Approaches to the Teaching of Grammar in ESL*, by David M. Davidson. $2.95. (ED 154 620)

6. *From the Community to the Classroom: Gathering Second-Language Speech Samples*, by Barbara F. Freed. $2.95. (ED 157 404)

7. *Kinesics and Cross-Cultural Understanding*, by Genelle G. Morain. $2.95. (ED 157 405)

8. *New Perspectives on Teaching Vocabulary*, by Howard H. Keller. $2.95. (ED 157 406)

9. *Teacher Talk: Language in the Classroom*, by Shirley B. Heath. $2.95. (ED 158 575)

10. *Language and Linguistics: Bases for a Curriculum*, by Julia S. Falk. $2.95. (ED 158 576)

11. *Teaching Culture: Strategies and Techniques*, by Robert C. Lafayette. $2.95. (ED 157 407)

12. *Personality and Second Language Learning*, by Virginia D. Hodge. $2.95. (ED 157 408)

Volume 2 (1978-79)

13. *Games and Simulations in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Alice C. Omaggio. $5.95.

14. *Problems and Teaching Strategies in ESL Composition*, by Ann Raimes. $2.95.

15. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1977-78*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95.

16. *Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation*, by Marianne Inman. $4.95.

17. *Testing Oral Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Walter H. Bartz. $2.95.

18. *Intensive Foreign Language Courses*, by David P. Benseler and Renate A. Schulz. $4.95.

19. *Evaluating a Second Language Program*, by Gilbert A. Jarvis and Shirley J. Adams. $2.95.

20. *Reading a Second Language*, by G. Truett Cates and Janet K. Swaffar. $2.95.

21. *Chicano English*, by Allan A. Metcalf. $2.95.

22. *Adult Vocational ESL*, by Jo Ann Crandall. $5.95.

To subscribe to the complete series of publications, write to the Publications Department, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. The subscription rate is $32.00 per volume. Titles may also be ordered individually; add $1.75 postage and handling. Virginia residents add 4% sales tax. ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID.